



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,919	03/01/2002	Larry Lawson Jones	076706-201701/US	3793
73319                      7590                      08/17/2009 The TPL Group (OnSpec/TPL) 20400 Stevens Creek Blvd. Fifth Floor Cupertino, CA 95014				
EXAMINER				
ZIA, SYED				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2431				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/17/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/683,919

**Applicant(s)**

JONES ET AL.

**Examiner**

SYED ZIA

**Art Unit**

2431

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10-14, 21 and 23-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10-14, 21 and 23-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to amendments and remarks filed on May 11, 2009. Original application contained Claims 1-21. Applicant amended Claims 23 and added new Claims 25, Claims 1-3, 10-14, 21 and 23-25 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on May 11, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Applicants argued regarding independent Claims 1, 11, and 24 and stated that in the system of cited prior art "Burger is teaching to store this information on network server 114. This teaches away from storing a log of identifiers on a secure key device as recited in Applicant's claim 24".

This is not found persuasive. Applicant claimed storage device only keep identifier (a database key or ID provided by secure central key hub) of the locations visited [Fig. 4-5, paragraph 22-23]. Cited prior art Burger discloses a list of currently authorized locations for interface stations 104 stored in database 406 of the network server 114 (paragraph. 0146, Figs. 1 and 4) where the Packet Vault can be used by sending interface unit identifier ( a database key or ID) to the network server.

Thus, cited prior art does teach accessing authorized location by sending an identifier to a central server.

As a result, the system of cited prior art(s) does implement and teaches a system and method that relates to providing a device for secure identification which also make use of presently available installed infrastructure.

Applicants clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that the system of cited prior arts does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent Claims and in subsequent dependent Claims. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-3, 10-14, 21 and 23-25 are respectfully maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 10-14, 21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott et al. (U. S. Patent 6,671,808), and further in view of Burger (U. S. Pub. 2005/0060586 A1) (hereafter Burger).

1. Regarding Claim 1 Abbott teach and describe an apparatus (Fig.2, and 4) comprising: a port; a storage medium coupled to a and accessed by controller, wherein, the storage medium is to store an encrypted unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of an individual pre-associated with the apparatus and an encrypted log of unique identifier of locations the apparatus and the individual have visited, the controller coupled to the port to record in the encrypted log on the storage medium, a unique identifier corresponding to a locations the apparatus and the individual have visited; the controller configured to restrict the individual from modifying the encrypted unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of the individual pre-selected with the apparatus, encrypted log of unique identifiers of locations the apparatus and the individual have visited as stored in the storage medium; and the controller, configured to provide, in response to a request from an authorized requestor, one or more of the unique identifier of the apparatus, identity information of the individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and the unique identifiers of locations the apparatus and the individual have visited (col.3 line 26 to col.4 line 7, col.4 line 50 to line 62, col.5 line 12 to line 15, col.5 line 55 to col.6 line 60, and col.7 line 38 to col.9 line 65).

Although the system disclosed by Abbot shows all the features of the claimed limitation, as well as secure identification of individuals (users) when using the unique USB enabled device but Abbot does not specifically discuss in detail unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of an individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and the identity of locations of network nodes to which apparatus communicated with during transactions.

In an analogous art, Burger, on the other hand discloses computing environment that describe methods of portable electronic authorization system (Fig.1-2, 4) by engaging

transactions involving financial and/or non-financial media and devices, where apparatus has an authenticator that authenticates an identity of a user, and interface station conducting registration process when device access different locations [Fig.1-2, and paragraph 0019 – 0020, 0114 -0118, and 0146].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Abbot and Burger, because Burger's system of portable electronic authorization with plurality of unique devices for providing plurality of services, such as device management, business transaction, and location management, after authenticating the device and user by using embedded ID would not only enhance the trustworthiness of the user of portable device when tracking the device in a external network but will also generate a log of transactions and location where device was communicated and used (co.7 line 9 to line 15).

2. Regarding Claim 11 Abbott teach and describe a system for allowing for secure identification of an individual when accessing information (Fig.2, and 4) comprising: a central hub configured to communicate with a plurality of touchpoints, at least one of the plurality of touchpoints configured to communicate with at least one device; the at least one device comprising a port; a storage medium coupled to and accessed by a controller, wherein the storage medium is configured to store an encrypted unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of an individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and an encrypted log of unique identifiers of locations the apparatus and the individual have visited; the controller, coupled to the port, configured to record in the encrypted log on the storage medium, a unique identifier corresponding to a location the apparatus and the individual have visited; the controller

configured to restrict the individual from modifying the encrypted unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of the individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and the encrypted log of unique identifiers of locations the apparatus and the individual have visited, as stored in the storage medium; and

the controller, configured to provide, in response to a request from an authorized requestor, one or more of the unique identifier of the apparatus, identity information of the individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and the log of unique identifiers of locations the apparatus and the individual have visited (col.3 line 26 to col.4 line 7, col.4 line 50 to line 62, col.5 line 12 to line 15, col.5 line 55 to col.6 line 60, and col.7 line 38 to col.9 line 65).

Although the system disclosed by Abbot shows all the features of the claimed limitation, as well as secure identification of individuals (users) when using the unique USB enabled device but Abbot does not specifically discuss in detail unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of an individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and the identity of locations of network nodes to which apparatus communicated with during transactions.

In an analogous art, Burger, on the other hand discloses computing environment that describe methods of portable electronic authorization system (Fig.1-2, 4) by engaging transactions involving financial and/or non-financial media and devices, where apparatus has an authenticator that authenticates an identity of a user, and interface station conducting registration process when device access different locations [Fig.1-2, and paragraph 0019 – 0020, 0114 -0118, and 0146].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Abbot and Burger, because Burger's system of portable

electronic authorization with plurality of unique devices for providing plurality of services, such as device management, business transaction, and location management, after authenticating the device and user by using embedded ID would not only enhance the trustworthiness of the user of portable device when tracking the device in a external network but will also generate a log of transactions and location where device was communicated and used (co.7 line 9 to line 15).

3. Regarding Claim 24 Abbott teach and describe a secure key hub to serve as a centralized data collection point, the hub configured to:

receive and store information from at least one touchpoint regarding usage of a secure key device at the at least one touchpoint, the secure key device comprising a storage medium configured to store an encrypted unique identifier of the secure key device, encrypted identity information of a user of the secure key device, and an encrypted log of identifiers of locations at which the secure key device has been used; and provide information to the at least one touchpoint to match with information received by the at least one touchpoint from the secure key device in order to identify the user of the secure key device (col.3 line 26 to col.4 line 7, col.4 line 50 to line 62, col.5 line 12 to line 15, col.5 line 55 to col.6 line 60, and col.7 line 38 to col.9 line 65).

Although the system disclosed by Abbot shows all the features of the claimed limitation, as well as secure identification of individuals (users) when using the unique USB enabled device but Abbot does not specifically discuss in detail unique identifier of the apparatus, encrypted identity information of an individual pre-associated with the apparatus, and the identity of locations of network nodes to which apparatus communicated with during transactions.



In an analogous art, Burger, on the other hand discloses computing environment that describe methods of portable electronic authorization system (Fig.1-2, 4) by engaging transactions involving financial and/or non-financial media and devices, where apparatus has an authenticator that authenticates an identity of a user, and interface station conducting registration process when device access different locations [Fig.1-2, and paragraph 0019 – 0020, 0114 -0118, and 0146].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Abbot and Burger, because Burger's system of portable electronic authorization with plurality of unique devices for providing plurality of services, such as device management, business transaction, and location management, after authenticating the device and user by using embedded ID would not only enhance the trustworthiness of the user of portable device when tracking the device in a external network but will also generate a log of transactions and location where device was communicated and used (co.7 line 9 to line 15).

4. Claims 2-3, 10, 12-14, and 21, and 23 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claims 1, and 11. Furthermore, the system of Abbott and Burger teaches and describes a system wherein

As per Claim 2, the port comprises any one of a firewire port, USB port or an infiniband port (Abbot: col.3 line 26 to line 30, col.5 line 12 to line 14, Fig.1, Item 130, Fig.4 Item 402))

As per Claim 3, the storage medium comprises a memory (Abbot: Fig. 2A, col.4 line 50 to line 62).

As per Claim 10, the security information can be enhanced or modified by downloading data to the apparatus (Abbot: col.8 line 20 to line 33 and col.10 line 6 to line 11).

As per Claim 12, the port comprises any one of a firewire port, USB port or an infiniband port (Abbot: col.3 line 26 to line 30, col.5 line 12 to line 14, Fig.1, Item 130, Fig.4 Item 402).

As per Claim 13, at least one of the plurality of touchpoints comprises a personal computer (Abbot: Fig.1 Item 102).

As per Claim 14, the storage medium comprises a flash memory (Abbot: Fig. 2A, col.4 line 50 to line 62).

As per Claim 21, the security information within the at least one device can be enhanced or modified by downloading data to the at least one device (Abbot: col.8 line 20 to line 33, and col.10 line 6 to line 11).

As per Claim 23, the location of at least one of the plurality of touchpoints is selected from the group consisting of: touchpoint comprises any one of an airport, a car rental, a bank, and combinations thereof (Burger: [0125, 0135, and 0152]).

As per Claim 24, the log of identifiers does not have overwrite capability; and the at least one touchpoint is to read the log of identifiers and to log touchpoint information within the secure key device regarding usage of the secure key device at the at least one touchpoint (Abbott: col.3 line 26 to col.9 line 65, and Burger: [Fig.1-2, and paragraph 0019 – 0020, 0114 -0118, and 0146]).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SYED ZIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sz

August 14, 2009

/Syed Zia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431